



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/750,086	12/31/2003	Richard H. Hinkson	H0005941-0555	1897
7590 12/04/2006			EXAMINER	
HONEYWEL	L INTERNATIONAL	GARY, ERIKA A		
LAW DEPART			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
101 COLUMBIA ROAD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07692			ARTONI	TATER NOMBER
			2617	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, , , , ,	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/750,086	HINKSON, RICHARD H.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del>				
	Erika A. Gary	2617					
The MAIL INC DATE of this communication and	<u> </u>						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS							
<ul> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		•					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 60-74. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wivided below or appended.	Il be entered and an explanati	on of				
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	ut before or on the date of filing a N	lotice of Appeal will not be ent	ered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is necess	ary				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to provice 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	be vide a				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See</u> Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	າ condition for allowance beca	iuse:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
<i>,</i>							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 60-74 as being unpatentable over Thrasher in view of Fujisawa. Applicant argues that neither reference includes the term "security panel". The Examiner agrees that the exact term "security panel" is not used, however, both references include a device that performs the same functions of Applicant's security panel. In Thrasher, the security panel is represented by reference 120 in figure 1. In Fujisawa, the security panel is represented by the mobile telephone, figure 1, reference 11. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that both Thrasher and Fujisawa teach a security panel even though they are referred to by a different name.

PRIMARY EXAMINER